

## **REMARKS**

### **Allowance of Claims**

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's allowance of Claims 24, 25, 28-30, 33-35, 38, 39, 41, 43, 44, 46, 48, 49, 51, 53, 57-62, 72-74, 78-80, 84 and 86-90.

### **Entry of Amendment**

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner states on page 5 that Claims 69-71 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable over the prior art of record if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. It is noted that Claims 69-71 are directly dependent on independent Claims 63-65, respectively (there being no intervening claims).

Accordingly, Applicants are amending Claims 63-65 to include all of the limitations (and allowable features) of dependent Claims 69-71 (i.e. "a second impurity region;" "wherein the second impurity region is formed between the pair of the impurity regions," and "wherein a length of the second impurity region is longer than a channel length in the channel length direction"). Therefore, independent Claims 63-65 should be in an allowable condition.

As Applicants are merely incorporating the allowable subject matter of Claims 69-71 into Claims 63-65 (no other amendments are being made), it is respectfully requested that this amendment be entered and allowed as no further consideration or search should be necessary.

Applicants will now address the Examiner's rejections in the Office Action

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

#### Claims 63, 75 and 81

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner rejects Claims 63, 75 and 81 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito (US 5,818,083) together with Ham et al. (US 3,890,632). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicant traverses this rejection, as explained above, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant is amending independent Claim 63 to recite the allowable features of dependent Claim 69.

Therefore, amended independent Claim 63 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claim 63 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 64, 76, 82, 65, 77 and 83

The Examiner also rejects Claims 64, 76, 82, 65, 77 and 83 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito together with Ham et al. and Liu et al. (US 5,814,854). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicant traverses this rejection, as explained above, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant is amending independent Claims 64 and 65 to recite the allowable features of dependent Claims 70 and 71, respectively.

Therefore, amended independent Claims 64 and 65 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claims 64, 65 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: October 24, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/

Mark J. Murphy

Registration No. 34,225

COOK ALEX Ltd.  
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568